arXiv:0801.0650v2 [math.DG] 11 Jan 2008

# A proof of the DDVV conjecture and its equality case [*]

Ge Jianquan

Department of Mathematical Sciences, Tsinghua University,

Beijing 100084.

E-mail: gejq04@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn

Tang Zizhou[†]

School of Mathematical Sciences, Laboratory of Mathematics and Complex Systems,

Beijing Normal University, Beijing 100875.

E-mail: zztang@mx.cei.gov.cn

*Keywords: normal scalar curvature, mean curvature, commutator*

*MSC 2000: 53C42, 15A45.*

## Abstract

In this paper, we give a proof of the DDVV conjecture which is a pointwise inequality involving the scalar curvature, the normal scalar curvature and the mean curvature on a submanifold of a real space form. Furthermore we solved the problem of its equality case.

---

[*] The project is partially supported by the NSFC ( No.10531090 and No.10229101 ) and the Chang Jiang Scholars Program.

[†] The corresponding author.

# 1 Introduction

Let $f : M^n \to N^{n+m}(c)$ be an isometric immersion of an $n$-dimensional submanifold $M$ into the $(n+m)$-dimensional real space form $N^{n+m}(c)$ of constant sectional curvature $c$. The normalized scalar curvature $\rho$ and normal scalar curvature $\rho^{\perp}$ are defined by (see [DDVV])

$$\rho = \frac{2}{n(n-1)} \sum_{1=i<j}^{n} R(e_i, e_j, e_j, e_i),$$

$$\rho^{\perp} = \frac{2}{n(n-1)} (\sum_{1=i<j}^{n} \sum_{1=r<s}^{m} \langle R^{\perp}(e_i, e_j)\xi_r, \xi_s\rangle^2)^{\frac{1}{2}},$$

where $\{e_1, ..., e_n\}$ (resp. $\{\xi_1, ..., \xi_m\}$) is an orthonormal basis of the tangent (resp. normal) space, and $R$ (resp. $R^{\perp}$) is the curvature tensor of the tangent (resp. normal) bundle.

Let $h$ be the second fundamental form and let $H = \frac{1}{n}\ Tr\, h$ be the mean curvature vector field. The DDVV conjecture (see [DDVV]) says that there's a pointwise inequality among $\rho$, $\rho^{\perp}$ and $|H|^2$ as following:

$$\rho + \rho^{\perp} \leq |H|^2 + c.$$

Since this is a pointwise inequality, using Gauss and Ricci equations one can see that it's equivalent to the following algebraic inequality (see [DFV]):

**Conjecture 1.** Let $B_1, ..., B_m$ be $(n \times n)$ real symmetric matrices. Then

$$\sum_{r,s=1}^{m} \|[B_r, B_s]\|^2 \leq (\sum_{r=1}^{m} \|B_r\|^2)^2,$$

where $\|\cdot\|^2$ denotes the sum of squares of entries of the matrix and $[A, B] = AB - BA$ is the commutator of the matrices $A, B$.

The main purpose of this paper is to prove Conjecture 1 and also to give the equality condition:

**Theorem 1.1.** *Let $B_1, ..., B_m$ be $(n \times n)$ real symmetric matrices. Then*

$$\sum_{r,s=1}^{m} \|[B_r, B_s]\|^2 \leq (\sum_{r=1}^{m} \|B_r\|^2)^2,$$

*where the equality holds if and only if under some rotation*[1] *all* $B_r$*'s are zero except 2 matrices which can be written as*

$$P\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mu & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \mu & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}P^t, \quad P\begin{pmatrix} \mu & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & -\mu & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}P^t,$$

*where* $P$ *is an orthogonal* $(n \times n)$ *matrix.*

Therefore, we can solve the DDVV conjecture also with its equality conditions in terms of the shape operators:

**Corollary 1.2.** *Let* $f : M^n \to N^{n+m}(c)$ *be an isometric immersion. Then*

$$\rho + \rho^\perp \le |H|^2 + c,$$

*where the equality holds at some point* $p \in M$ *if and only if there exist an orthonormal basis* $\{e_1, ..., e_n\}$ *of* $T_pM$ *and an orthonormal basis* $\{\xi_1, ..., \xi_m\}$ *of* $T_p^\perp M$*, such that*

$$A_{\xi_1} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & \mu & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \mu & \lambda_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_1 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \lambda_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad A_{\xi_2} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_2+\mu & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_2-\mu & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_2 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \lambda_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$A_{\xi_r} = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_r & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_r & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \lambda_r & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & \lambda_r \end{pmatrix} \quad for\ \ r > 2.$$

**Remark.** By the same method, one can see that Conjecture 1 also holds for anti-symmetric matrices. However, the following example shows that Conjecture 1 fails when there're both symmetric and anti-symmetric matrices in $\{B_1, ..., B_m\}$, which was conjectured in [Lu1].

---

[1] An orthogonal $m \times m$ matrix $R = (R_{rs})$ acts as a rotation on $(B_1, ..., B_m)$ by $R(B_r) = \sum_{s=1}^m R_{sr}B_s$.

**Example.** Let $B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$, $B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $B_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Then the conclusion of Conjecture 1 fails.

We point out that the inequality and its equality condition of Theorem 1.1 (resp. Corollary 1.2) for $m = 2$ was given in [Ch] (resp. [DDVV]). When $n = 2, 3$, or $m = 2, 3$, the inequality was proved in several papers (see [Lu1] for references). For general $n$, $m$, a weaker version was proved in [DFV]. After we have solved the conjecture and its equality case, we find very recently that Zhiqin Lu has posed a proof of the inequality in his homepage without the equality case (see [Lu2]). Since we use a quite different method and work out the equality condition besides the inequality, we'd like to show it in literature.

Finally, it's our pleasure to thank Professor Weiping Zhang for introducing [Lu1] to us and his encouragements. Many thanks as well to Professors Marcos Dajczer and Ruy Tojeiro for their useful comments and suggestions to the previous version of this paper.

## 2 Notations and preparing lemmas

Throughout this paper, we denote by $M(m, n)$ the space of $m \times n$ real matrices, $M(n)$ the space of $n \times n$ real matrices and $SM(n)$ the $N := \frac{n(n+1)}{2}$ dimensional subspace of symmetric matrices in $M(n)$.

For every $(i, j)$ with $1 \leq i \leq j \leq n$, let

$$\hat{E}_{ij} := \begin{cases} E_{ii}, & i = j, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(E_{ij} + E_{ji}), & i < j, \end{cases}$$

where $E_{ij} \in M(n)$ is the matrix with $(i, j)$ entry 1 and all others 0. Clearly $\{\hat{E}_{ij}\}_{i \leq j}$ is an orthonormal basis of $SM(n)$. Let's take an order of the indices set $S := \{(i, j) | 1 \leq i \leq j \leq n\}$ by

$$(i, j) < (k, l) \;\; if\; and\; only\; if \;\; i < k \; or \; i = k, j < l. \tag{2.1}$$

In this way we can identify $S$ with $\{1, ..., N\}$ and write elements of $S$ in Greek, i.e. for $\alpha = (i, j) \in S$, we can say $1 \leq \alpha \leq N$.

For $\alpha = (i, j) < (k, l) = \beta$ in $S$, direct calculations imply

$$\|[\hat{E}_\alpha, \hat{E}_\beta]\|^2 = \begin{cases} 1, & i = j = k < l \textit{ or } i < j = k = l; \\ \frac{1}{2}, & i < j = k < l \textit{ or } i = k < j < l \textit{ or } i < k < j = l; \\ 0, & \textit{otherwise}, \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

and for any $\alpha, \beta \in S$,

$$\sum_{\gamma \in S} \langle\, [\hat{E}_\alpha, \hat{E}_\gamma],\ [\hat{E}_\beta, \hat{E}_\gamma]\,\rangle = n\delta_{\alpha\beta} - \delta_\alpha \delta_\beta, \tag{2.3}$$

where $\delta_{\alpha\beta} = \delta_{ik}\delta_{jl}$, $\delta_\alpha = \delta_{ij}$, $\delta_\beta = \delta_{kl}$ and $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$ is the standard inner product of $M(n)$.

Let $\{\hat{Q}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in S}$ be any orthonormal basis of $SM(n)$. There exists a unique orthogonal matrix $Q \in O(N)$ such that $(\hat{Q}_1, ..., \hat{Q}_N) = (\hat{E}_1, ..., \hat{E}_N)Q$, i.e. $\hat{Q}_\alpha = \sum_\beta q_{\beta\alpha} \hat{E}_\beta$ for $Q = (q_{\alpha\beta})_{N \times N}$ and if $\hat{Q}_\alpha = (\hat{q}^\alpha_{ij})_{n \times n}$,

$$\hat{q}^\alpha_{ij} = \hat{q}^\alpha_{ji} = \begin{cases} q_{\beta\alpha}, & \beta = (i, j) \textit{ and } i = j, \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} q_{\beta\alpha}, & \beta = (i, j) \textit{ and } i < j. \end{cases}$$

Let $\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n$ be $n$ real numbers satisfying $\sum_i \lambda_i^2 = 1$ and $\lambda_1 \geq ... \geq \lambda_n$. Denote $I_1 := \{j | \lambda_1 - \lambda_j > 1\}$, $I_2 := \{i | \lambda_i - \lambda_n > 1\}$, $I := \{(i, j) | \lambda_i - \lambda_j > 1\}$ and $n_0$ the number of elements of $I$. Then $(\{1\} \times I_1) \cup (I_2 \times \{n\}) \subset I \subset S$. In fact, it can be shown

**Lemma 2.1.** *We have either*

$$I = \{1\} \times I_1 \textit{ or } I = I_2 \times \{n\}.$$

*Proof.* If $n_0 = 0$, the three sets are all empty. If $n_0 = 1$, the only element must be $(1, n)$ and the three sets are equal. Now let $(1, n)$, $(i_1, j_1)$ be two different elements of $I$, i.e. $\lambda_1 - \lambda_n \geq \lambda_{i_1} - \lambda_{j_1} > 1$ and $(1, n) \neq (i_1, j_1)$. We assert that $(i_1 = 1, j_1 \neq n)$ or $(i_1 \neq 1, j_1 = n)$, which shows exactly that $I = \{1\} \times I_1 \cup I_2 \times \{n\}$. Otherwise, $1, i_1, j_1, n$ will be 4 different elements in $\{1, ..., n\}$ and thus

$$1 \geq \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_{i_1}^2 + \lambda_{j_1}^2 + \lambda_n^2 \geq \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_1 - \lambda_n)^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_{i_1} - \lambda_{j_1})^2 > 1$$

is a contradiction. Without loss of generality, we can assume $(i_1, j_1) \in \{1\} \times I_1$. Then it'll be seen that $I_2 \times \{n\} = \{(1, n)\}$ and thus $I = \{1\} \times I_1$ which completes the proof. Otherwise, if there's another element, say $(i_2, n)$ in $I_2 \times \{n\}$, then $i_1 = 1, j_1, i_2, n$ are 4 different elements in $\{1, ..., n\}$ and come to the same contradiction as above. $\square$

**Lemma 2.2.**

$$\sum_{(i,j)\in I} [(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2 - 1] \le 1,$$

*where the equality holds in the case when* $I = \{1\} \times I_1$ *if and only if* $1 \le n_0 < n$ *and* $\lambda_1 = \sqrt{\frac{n_0}{n_0+1}}, \lambda_{n-n_0+1} = ... = \lambda_n = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{n_0^2+n_0}}, \lambda_k = 0$ *for others.*

*Proof.* Without loss of generality, we can assume that $I = \{1\} \times I_1$ by Lemma 2.1. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{(i,j)\in I} [(\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2 - 1] &= \sum_{j\in I_1} (\lambda_1^2 + \lambda_j^2 - 2\lambda_1\lambda_j) - n_0 = n_0\lambda_1^2 + \sum_{j\in I_1} \lambda_j^2 - 2\lambda_1 \sum_{j\in I_1} \lambda_j - n_0 \\
&\le (n_0+1)\lambda_1^2 + \sum_{j\in I_1} \lambda_j^2 + (\sum_{j\in I_1} \lambda_j)^2 - n_0 \le (n_0+1)(\lambda_1^2 + \sum_{j\in I_1} \lambda_j^2) - n_0 \\
&\le (n_0+1)\sum_i \lambda_i^2 - n_0 = 1,
\end{aligned}$$

where the equality condition is easily seen from the proof. $\square$

**Lemma 2.3.** $\sum_{\beta\in J_\alpha} (\|[\hat{Q}_\alpha, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 - 1) \le 1$ *for any* $Q \in O(N)$, $\alpha \in S$ *and* $J_\alpha \subset S$.

*Proof.* Given $\alpha \in S$, without loss of generality, we can assume $\hat{Q}_\alpha = diag(\lambda_1, ..., \lambda_n)$ with $\sum_i \lambda_i^2 = 1$ and $\lambda_1 \ge ... \ge \lambda_n$. Then by Lemma 2.2,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\beta\in J_\alpha} (\|[\hat{Q}_\alpha, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 - 1) &= \sum_{\beta\in J_\alpha} \sum_{i,j=1}^{n} ((\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2 - 1)(\hat{q}_{ij}^\beta)^2 = \sum_{\beta\in J_\alpha} \sum_{(i,j)=\gamma\in S} ((\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2 - 1) q_{\gamma\beta}^2 \\
&\le \sum_{(i,j)=\gamma\in I} ((\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2 - 1) \sum_{\beta\in J_\alpha} q_{\gamma\beta}^2 \le \sum_{(i,j)\in I} ((\lambda_i - \lambda_j)^2 - 1) \le 1.
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

**Lemma 2.4.** $\sum_{\beta\in S} \|[\hat{Q}_\alpha, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 \le n$ *for any* $Q \in O(N)$, $\alpha \in S$.

*Proof.* It follows from (2.3) that

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{\beta\in S} \|[\hat{Q}_\alpha, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 &= \sum_{\beta\gamma\tau\xi\eta} q_{\gamma\alpha} q_{\xi\alpha} q_{\tau\beta} q_{\eta\beta} \langle\, [\hat{E}_\gamma, \hat{E}_\tau],\ [\hat{E}_\xi, \hat{E}_\eta]\, \rangle = \sum_{\gamma\xi} q_{\gamma\alpha} q_{\xi\alpha} \sum_{\tau} \langle\, [\hat{E}_\gamma, \hat{E}_\tau],\ [\hat{E}_\xi, \hat{E}_\tau]\, \rangle \\
&= \sum_{\gamma\xi} q_{\gamma\alpha} q_{\xi\alpha} (n\delta_{\gamma\xi} - \delta_\gamma \delta_\xi) = n \sum_\gamma q_{\gamma\alpha}^2 - (\sum_i \hat{q}_{ii}^\alpha)^2 \le n.
\end{aligned}$$

$\square$

Now let $\varphi : M(m,n) \longrightarrow M(C_m^2, C_n^2)$ be the map defined by $\varphi(A)_{(i,j)(k,l)} := A\binom{k\,l}{i\,j}$, where $1 \le i < j \le m$, $1 \le k < l \le n$ and $A\binom{k\,l}{i\,j} = a_{ik}a_{jl} - a_{il}a_{jk}$ is the discriminant of the sub-matrix of $A$ with the rows $i, j$, the columns $k, l$, arranged with the same ordering as in (2.1). It's easily seen that $\varphi(I_n) = I_{C_n^2}$, $\varphi(A)^t = \varphi(A^t)$ and the following

**Lemma 2.5.** *The map $\varphi$ preserves the matrix product, i.e. $\varphi(AB) = \varphi(A)\varphi(B)$ holds for $A \in M(m,k)$, $B \in M(k,n)$.*

## 3 Proof of the main results

Let $B_1, ..., B_m$ be any real symmetric $n \times n$ matrices. Their coefficients under the standard basis $\{\hat{E}_\alpha\}_{\alpha \in S}$ of $SM(n)$ are determined by a matrix $B \in M(N,m)$ as $(B_1, ..., B_m) = (\hat{E}_1, ..., \hat{E}_N)B$. Taking the same ordering as in (2.1) for $1 \le r < s \le m$ and $1 \le \alpha < \beta \le N$, we arrange $\{[B_r, B_s]\}_{r<s}$, $\{[\hat{E}_\alpha, \hat{E}_\beta]\}_{\alpha<\beta}$ into $C_m^2$, $C_N^2$ vectors respectively. We first observe that

$$([B_1, B_2], ..., [B_{m-1}, B_m]) = ([\hat{E}_1, \hat{E}_2], ..., [\hat{E}_{N-1}, \hat{E}_N]) \cdot \varphi(B).$$

Let $C(E)$ denote the matrix in $M(C_N^2)$ defined by $C(E)_{(\alpha,\beta)(\gamma,\tau)} := \langle\, [\hat{E}_\alpha, \hat{E}_\beta],\ [\hat{E}_\gamma, \hat{E}_\tau]\,\rangle$, for $1 \le \alpha < \beta \le N$, $1 \le \gamma < \tau \le N$. Moreover we will use the same notation for $\{B_r\}$ and $\{\hat{Q}_\alpha\}$, i.e. $C(B)$ and $C(Q)$ respectively. Then it's obvious that

$$C(B) = \varphi(B^t)C(E)\varphi(B), \quad C(Q) = \varphi(Q^t)C(E)\varphi(Q).$$

Since $BB^t$ is a semi-positive definite matrix in $SM(N)$, there exists an orthogonal matrix $Q \in SO(N)$ such that $BB^t = Q\, diag(x_1, ..., x_N)\, Q^t$ with $x_\alpha \ge 0$, $1 \le \alpha \le N$. Thus

$$\sum_{r=1}^m \|B_r\|^2 = \|B\|^2 = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N x_\alpha$$

and hence by Lemma 2.5

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{r,s=1}^m \|[B_r, B_s]\|^2 &= 2Tr\, C(B) = 2Tr\, \varphi(B^t)C(E)\varphi(B) = 2Tr\, \varphi(BB^t)C(E) \\ &= 2Tr\, \varphi(diag(x_1, ..., x_N))C(Q) = \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^N x_\alpha x_\beta \|[\hat{Q}_\alpha, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2. \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

We are now ready to prove Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.1.** For the inequality, by the arguments above it is equivalent to prove

$$\sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^{N} x_\alpha x_\beta \|[\hat{Q}_\alpha, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 \leq (\sum_{\alpha=1}^{N} x_\alpha)^2, \quad for\ any\ x \in \mathbb{R}^N_+\ and\ Q \in SO(N), \tag{3.2}$$

where $\mathbb{R}^N_+ := \{0 \neq x = (x_1, ..., x_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N | x_\alpha \geq 0, 1 \leq \alpha \leq N\}$ is the cone spanned by the positive axes of $\mathbb{R}^N$.

Let $f_Q(x) = F(x, Q) := \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^N x_\alpha x_\beta \|[\hat{Q}_\alpha, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 - (\sum_{\alpha=1}^N x_\alpha)^2$. Then $F$ is a continuous function defined on $\mathbb{R}^N \times SO(N)$ and thus uniformly continuous on any compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^N \times SO(N)$. Let $\triangle := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N_+ | \sum_\alpha x_\alpha = 1\}$ and for any sufficiently small $\varepsilon > 0$, $\triangle_\varepsilon := \{x \in \triangle | x_\alpha \geq \varepsilon, 1 \leq \alpha \leq N\}$, and let $G := \{Q \in SO(N) | f_Q(x) \leq 0, \forall x \in \triangle\}$, $G_\varepsilon := \{Q \in SO(N) | f_Q(x) < 0, \forall x \in \triangle_\varepsilon\}$. We claim that

$$G = \lim_{\varepsilon \to 0} G_\varepsilon = SO(N).$$

Note that this implies (3.2) and thus proves the inequality. In fact we can show

$$G_\varepsilon = SO(N) \quad for\ any\ sufficiently\ small\ \varepsilon > 0. \tag{3.3}$$

To prove (3.3), we use the continuity method which consists of the following three steps:

step1: $I_N \in G_\varepsilon$, (thus $G_\varepsilon \neq \emptyset$),

step2: $G_\varepsilon$ is open in $SO(N)$,

step3: $G_\varepsilon$ is closed in $SO(N)$.

Since $F$ is uniformly continuous on $\triangle_\varepsilon \times SO(N)$, step2 is obvious.

proof of step1: Now for any $x \in \triangle_\varepsilon$, $f_{I_N}(x) = \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^N x_\alpha x_\beta \|[\hat{E}_\alpha, \hat{E}_\beta]\|^2 - 1$.

It follows from (2.2) that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{I_N}(x) &= 2\{\sum_{i<j}(x_{ii}x_{ij} + x_{ij}x_{jj}) + \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i<j<k}(x_{ij}x_{jk} + x_{ij}x_{ik} + x_{ik}x_{jk})\} - 1 \\ &= 2\sum_{i<j}(x_{ii}x_{ij} + x_{ij}x_{jj}) + \sum_{i<j<k}(x_{ij}x_{jk} + x_{ij}x_{ik} + x_{ik}x_{jk}) - (\sum_{i\leq j}^{N} x_{ij})^2 \\ &< 0. \end{aligned}$$

which means $I_N \in G_\varepsilon$.

proof of step3: We only need to prove the following a priori estimate:

**a priori estimate**: Suppose $f_Q(x) \leq 0$, for every $x \in \triangle_\varepsilon$. Then $f_Q(x) < 0$, for every $x \in \triangle_\varepsilon$.

(proof of the a priori estimate) If there's a point $y \in \triangle_\varepsilon$ such that $f_Q(y) = 0$, without loss of generality, we can assume $y \in \triangle_\varepsilon^\gamma := \{x \in \triangle_\varepsilon | x_\alpha > \varepsilon, for\ \alpha \leq \gamma, x_\beta = \varepsilon, for\ \beta > \gamma\}$ for some $1 \leq \gamma \leq N$. Then $y$ is a maximum point of $f_Q(x)$ in the cone spanned by $\triangle_\varepsilon$ and an interior maximum point in $\triangle_\varepsilon^\gamma$. Therefore, there exist some numbers $b_{\gamma+1}, ..., b_N$ and a number $a$ such that

$$\begin{cases} (\frac{\partial f_Q}{\partial x_1}(y), ..., \frac{\partial f_Q}{\partial x_\gamma}(y)) = 2a(1, ..., 1), \\ (\frac{\partial f_Q}{\partial x_{\gamma+1}}(y), ..., \frac{\partial f_Q}{\partial x_N}(y)) = 2(b_{\gamma+1}, ..., b_N), \end{cases} \tag{3.4}$$

or equivalently

$$\sum_{\beta=1}^{N} y_\beta(\|[\hat{Q}_\alpha, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2) - 1 = \begin{cases} a, & \alpha \leq \gamma, \\ b_\alpha, & \alpha > \gamma, \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

and hence

$$f_Q(y) = (\sum_{\alpha=1}^{\gamma} y_\alpha)a + (\sum_{\alpha=\gamma+1}^{N} b_\alpha)\varepsilon = 0, \quad \sum_{\alpha=1}^{\gamma} y_\alpha + (N-\gamma)\varepsilon = 1.$$

Meanwhile, one can see that $\frac{\partial f_Q}{\partial \nu}(y) = 2(a\gamma + \sum_{\alpha=\gamma+1}^{N} b_\alpha) \leq 0$, where $\nu = (1, ..., 1)$ is the normal vector of $\triangle$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$. For any sufficiently small $\varepsilon$ (such as $\varepsilon < \frac{1}{N}$), it follows from the above three formulas that $a \geq 0$. Without loss of generality, we assume $y_1 = max\{y_1, ..., y_\gamma\} > \varepsilon$ and let $J := \{\beta \in S | \|[\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 \geq 1\}$, $n_1$ be the number of elements of $J$. Now combining Lemma 2.3 , Lemma 2.4 and formula (3.5) will give a contradiction as following:

$$\begin{aligned} 1 \leq 1 + a &= \sum_{\beta=2}^{N} y_\beta \|[\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 = \sum_{\beta \in J} y_\beta(\|[\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 - 1) + \sum_{\beta \in J} y_\beta + \sum_{\beta \in S/J} y_\beta \|[\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 \\ &\leq y_1 \sum_{\beta \in J}(\|[\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 - 1) + \sum_{\beta \in J} y_\beta + \sum_{\beta \in S/J} y_\beta \|[\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 \\ &\leq y_1 + \sum_{\beta \in J} y_\beta + \sum_{\beta \in S/J} y_\beta \|[\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 \leq \sum_{\beta=1}^{N} y_\beta = 1, \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

thus

$$y_\beta = y_1, \ \ for\ \beta \in J, \quad \sum_{\beta \in J} \|[\hat{Q}_1, \hat{Q}_\beta]\|^2 = n_1 + 1 \leq n < N, \tag{3.7}$$

hence $S/(J \cup \{1\}) \neq \emptyset$ and the last inequality in formula (3.6) should be strictly less because of the definition of $J$ and the positivity of $y_\beta$ for $\beta \in S/(J \cup \{1\})$.

Now we come to consider the equality condition of Conjecture 1 in the sight of the proof of the a priori estimate.

If there's a point $y \in \triangle$ such that $f_Q(y) = 0$, without loss of generality, we can assume $y \in \triangle^\gamma := \{x \in \triangle | x_\alpha > 0, \forall \alpha \leq \gamma, x_\beta = 0, \forall \beta > \gamma\}$ for some $1 \leq \gamma \leq N$. Then $y$ is a maximum point of $f_Q(x)$ in $\mathbb{R}^N_+$ and an interior maximum point in $\triangle^\gamma$. Therefore, we have the same conclusions as (3.4), (3.5), (3.6), (3.7) when $\gamma = n_1 + 1$. From formula (3.7), Lemma 2.1, Lemma 2.2 and the proof of Lemma 2.3, we know that all $\hat{Q}_\beta$ for $\beta \in J \cup \{1\}$ have the same rank 2 and $n_0 = n_1 = 1$. Thus $\gamma = 2$ and the equality case of Lemma 2.2 and Lemma 2.3 tell us these two matrices must be in the forms given in Theorem 1.1.

**Proof of Corollary 1.2.** When $H \neq 0$, we can choose an orthonormal basis $\{u_1, ..., u_m\}$ of $T_p^\perp M$ such that $u_1 = \frac{H}{|H|}$. When $H = 0$, the basis $\{u_r\}$ can be chose arbitrarily. Put $B_1 = A_{u_1} - |H| I_n$, $B_r = A_{u_r}$ for $2 \leq r \leq m$. Then the conclusions follow from Theorem 1.1 and [DFV].

# References

[Ch] S.S.Chern. *Minimal Submanifolds in a Riemannian Manifold* (mimeographed), University of Kansas, Lawrence, 1968.

[DDVV] P. J. De Smet, F. Dillen, L. Verstraelen, and L. Vrancken. *A pointwise inequality in submanifold theory*, Arch. Math. (Brno), 35(2):115-128, 1999.

[DFV] F. Dillen, J. Fastenakels, and J. Veken. *Remarks on an inequality involving the normal scalar curvature*, to appear in the Proceedings of the International Congress on Pure and Applied Differential Geometry PADGE 2007.

[Lu1] Z.Q.Lu. *Recent developments of the DDVV conjecture*, arXiv:0708.3201v1, 2007.

[Lu2] Z.Q.Lu. *Proof of the normal scalar curvature conjecture*, arXiv:0711.3510v1, 2007.